REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the present application are respectfully requested. Claims 1-44 and 48-51 remain pending in the application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 6, 7, 12, 13, 21, 24, 32, 35, 43, 48, 49 and 51 are amended. No new matter is added.

In numbered paragraph 6, pages 2-8 of the Office Action, claims 1-12 and 49 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,872,917 to Hellman ("Hellman") in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,171,555 to Salowey et al. ("Salowey et al."). In numbered paragraph 7, pages 8-19 of the Office Action, claims 13-18, 24-29, 35-40, 48, 50 and 51 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over the Hellman patent in view of the Salowey et al. patent, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,535,980 to Kumar et al. ("Kumar et al."). In numbered paragraph 8, pages 19-21 of the Office Action, claims 19-23, 30-34 and 41-44 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over the Hellman patent and the Salowey et al. patent, in view of the Kumar et al. patent, and further in view of the Yokota patent (Based upon the Examiner's reference to "Yokota" in paragraph 8, Applicants have presumed that the Examiner means U.S. Patent No. 7,155,607 to Yokota et al. ("Yokota et al.")). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Applicants have discussed of record Applicants' disclosure of an exemplary server computer 14 which generates a credential (cred) for a client computer 12 in step 310 that proves the identity of the client computer 12. For the embodiment shown in FIG. 3, Applicants have disclosed that in step 304, an exemplary server computer chooses security parameters and an expiration time (exp) for the

credential. In the illustrated embodiment, the security parameters include a hash seed (s), and a maximum number of times (m) to run a hash function (e.g., specification at paragraph [0024]). Applicants have further discussed of record that in step 312, a server computer 14 transmits the session information (sessioninfo), seed (s), maximum times (m) to run the hash function, the expiration time (exp), and the credential (cred) encrypted by the initial session key (k1) to the client computer 12 in order to issue the credential. (e.g., specification at paragraph [0025]).

The foregoing features are broadly encompassed by claim 1, which recites a method for authenticating a computer, including among other features, issuing a credential based on session information, security parameters, credential information and an expiration time from a first computer to a second computer, transmitting said credential and a computer challenge from the second computer to the first computer when the second computer is to be authenticated, transmitting a response to said computer challenge from said first computer to said second computer, and verifying said response with said second computer in order to authenticate and verify said computers.

Hellman illustrates in FIG. 1 a data flow between user and host computers 10 and 12, respectively. The Examiner has admitted on page 3 of the Office Action that "Hellman does not explicitly disclose issuing a credential from a first computer to a second computer and authentication of the computers." At least for these reasons, the Hellman patent would not have taught the features of claim 1, including the recited features of issuing a credential based on session information, security parameters, credential information and an expiration time from a first computer to a second computer, ...and verifying said response with said second computer in order

to authenticate and verify said computers. Claims 7, 13, 24, 35, 48 and 49 similarly recite at least the features of issuing a credential based on session information, security parameters, credential information and an expiration time from a first computer to a second computer.

The Salowey et al. patent does not cure the deficiencies of the Hellman patent. The Salowey et al. patent was applied for its various disclosures relating to "a security credential" (col. 3, lines 19-21), in which it was disclosed that specific embodiments can bootstrap digital certificates, public/private key pairs, and other credentials to supplicants, in-band, within an EAP-SIM or EAP-AKA conversation and without initiating a new session or exchanging special-purpose keys to protect distribution of the credentials (abstract; col. 3, lines 35-40). However, the Salowey et al. patent would not have taught or suggested specifically, among other recited features, issuing a credential based on session information, security parameters, credential information and an expiration time from a first computer to a second computer, ...and verifying said response with said second computer in order to authenticate and verify said computers, as recited in claim 1, and as similarly recited in claims 7, 13, 24, 35, 48 and 49.

The Kumar et al. and Yokota et al. patents do not cure the deficiencies of the Hellman and Salowey et al. patents. The Kumar et al. patent was applied by the Examiner for various mentions of an authentication system, as they relate to challenge response systems (col. 2, lines 30-50). The Yokota et al. patent was applied by the Examiner for the disclosure of a random number generating unit operating with a challenge data sending unit for the purpose of "judging whether or not to authenticate the second apparatus by determining if the piece of response

data and the random number are identical" (col. 5, line 65 through col. 6, line 15). However, the Kumar et al. patent and the Yokota et al. patent, even if variously combined with the Hellman and Salowey et al. patents, would not have taught or suggested issuing a credential based on session information, security parameters, credential information and an expiration time from a first computer to a second computer, ...and verifying said response with said second computer in order to authenticate and verify said computers, as recited in claim 1, and as similarly recited in claims 7, 13, 24, 35, 48 and 49.

For at least these reasons, Applicants' claims 1, 7, 13, 24, 35, 48 and 49 are allowable. The remaining claims depend from the respective independent claim, and recite additional advantageous features which further distinguish over the documents relied upon by the Examiner. As such, the present application is in condition for allowance.

All objections and rejections raised in the Office Action having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance and a Notice of Allowance is respectfully solicited.

In the event that there are any questions concerning this paper, or the application in general, the Examiner is respectfully urged to telephone Applicants' undersigned representative so that prosecution of the application may be expedited.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC

Date: <u>March 4, 2008</u>   By: _____

Richard J. Kim
Registration No. 48360

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, VA 22313-1404
703 836 6620